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Dear Colonel Wilson:

Our review of the Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Chicago Bridge and Iron Company raises new questions about the permit application. The deletion of a large portion of buffer area now introduces the possibility that a more environmentally sensitive type of industry may develop on the 108 acres retained in the buffer area. If the reason for this modification is to provide for a possible expansion for the Chicago Bridge and Iron Company plant, we would have no serious objection. However, no such assurance is provided since the Supplement speaks of a future disposition of the 108 acres as not conditioned.

With a real uncertainty as to the future use of this additional acreage, we feel it important to have the full justification of the buffer area. For the full and fair public benefit to be obtained from Chicago Bridge and Iron Company vicinity, we shall continue to support the open-ended nature of the buffer area.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John A. Little, Deputy
on the basis of these findings, a decision would then be made on which alternative to pursue. The decision would be based on a balance of the potential benefits and the environmental impacts of each alternative. The analysis would consider issues such as the impact on the local environment, the viability of the project, and the economic benefits to the area.

To our disappointment, the Supplement to the Final Environmental Statement provides no additional data concerning alternatives. Unless this serious and persistent defect in the environmental documents for the CBI permit application is cured, the Department will continue to maintain its objection to permit issuance.

The Department of the Interior has followed with keen interest the proposal to designate Port Royal Sound as a marine sanctuary. We urge the Corps of Engineers to seriously consider whether CBI's proposed re-designation of land use, and the related potential for additional industrialization as Victoria Bluff would in any way affect the suitability of Port Royal Sound for marine sanctuary status.

In summary, the Department of the Interior's two major objections to issuance of the CBI permit remain unresolved. The determination by CBI to reduce its buffer zone to 300 acres and to retain this land in an unrestricted use status precludes any likelihood of this Department's concurrence in issuance of the permit for this project. The continued failure of the Environmental Statement to properly address alternatives in an additional impact to removal of our objections.

We emphatically hold to our position of record and respectfully urge both the applicant and the Department of the Army to reconsider these important matters.

responsive to these comments, creating a spent seven lines to an explanation of why four of the various alternative sites were re-
jected by CBI. In our comments on the Final Statement we argued our ins-
tance that alternative be introduced in sufficient detail to permit meaningful comparisons among them.

WANT OF SITE: VICTORIA BLUFF (S 1/4 N 1/2, R 33 T 27)

ONE-LINE DESCRIPTION: A high-quality emergent forest with a salt marsh habitat within the Victoria Bluff marsh - tidal associations and intertidal vegetation.

TENURE/OWNERSHIP: CA 33/4A, B, Ca, Ta, NH, M, NH, NE, Pa,

LOCATION: Beaufort County, South Carolina

LATITUDE - LONGITUDE:


SIZE: Victoria Bluff = 20 to 50 acres; total sound = 47,200 acres

OWNERSHIP: Water-State; terrestrial portion - various private owners.

ADMINISTERING AGENCY: South Carolina Water Resources Commission

CURRENT LAND USE: Probably hunting and fishing.

DANGER TO AREA OR VULNERABILITY:

Possible pollution from upstream, forest fires, some cutting and cutting.

SENSITIVITY OF AREA: None

SIGNIFICANCE OF AREA:

Excellent and diverse wildlife (shellfish) habitat, with high deer and aquatic populations. Entire marsh and sound should be considered as Victoria Bluff is an important timbered area relatively undisturbed in midst of large unpolluted marsh area.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS:

Sea coast, salt marshes, and islands.

OUTSTANDING GEOLOGICAL FEATURES:

ECOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION:

A dense and hardwood forest area above the water, with expanding landward marsh from. There is a brackish body of freshwater pond and limited intertidal feeding area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Height (cm)</th>
<th>Spread (cm)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Height (cm)</th>
<th>Spread (cm)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Abb. - Abundant
- bd - broad
- cl - clump
- ft - foot, feet
- lg - large
- med. - medium
- sm. - small
- sp. - species
October 14, 1975

Colonel Harry S. Wilson, Jr.
District Engineer
Charleston District, Corps of Engineers
Department of the Army
P. O. Box 916
Charleston, South Carolina 29401

Dear Colonel Wilson:

The State Clearinghouse has reviewed the project notification and determined the project does not require a consultation with the Corps of Engineers. However, you should be aware that the South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department is reviewing the project and will provide comments on its findings.

If there are any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Elmer C. Whitten, Jr.
State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
5. That the new draft supplement address the objections raised by the Council on environmental factors to issuance of the permit.

6. And that the new draft supplement address the objection of Fort Royal Sound as a marine sanctuary and the status of NOAA's consideration of the sanctuary designation.

I am not suggesting that another public hearing be held on this already protracted case. The Charleston District's approach to a public hearing is apparently based on the premise that the federal government need not tell the public anything as of the point that the Corps or CBI does not want the public to know. It would thus be pointless to stage another public hearing.

entitled "Letters of Comment on Final EIS." That document raises several questions:

1. Why wasn't that document made available for public review with the supplement prior to the September 9 public hearing?

2. Is it the general policy of the Corps, or was it the Charleston District's own decision, to keep responses to comments on the final impact statement from the public, even when, as in this case — a supplement to the EIS — was deemed necessary and another public hearing was held?

3. What can be done to instill a greater sense of responsiveness and responsibility to the public in the Charleston District office?
Dear Secretary Veasey,

The National Advisory Committee believes the so-called "Supplement" to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) prepared by the Corps, District Engineer's Office, the Office of the Chief of Engineers, and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, should contain the same information and analysis as included in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Consequently, the Committee feels that the Supplement does not sufficiently address the environmental impacts of the project as originally proposed.

In her letter of October 4, 1979, the Honorable Erma K. V. Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Army, Washington, D.C. 20314, informed me that the Supplement was prepared for the final statement that is not necessarily subject to the regulations of the Corps of Engineers. However, in the case of the National Advisory Committee, the Supplement is subject to the regulations pertaining to the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

"Whenever the final environmental statement is filed becomes deficient because certain environmental effects at the project site were not discussed or design features or project features were modified significantly after the filing of the original environmental statement, an appropriate supplement to the final statement shall be prepared. The supplement will be prepared in draft form and submitted for review and comment period allowed after publication by CEQ in the Federal Register for the draft."

We submit that the supplement prepared by the District Engineer's Office is not the "appropriate supplement" required by the Corps regulation. The supplement does not reduce the deficiencies in the FEIS created by the Corps's change in plans and features from the project proposed - let alone the gross deficiencies in the FEIS on the situation proposed. The supplement does not constitute the "impartial study" as required by CEQ, but is the District Engineer's Office's attempt to incorporate the changes into the project in a way that will reduce the environmental impact.

I trust the Committee will agree.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Position]

[Organization]
PUBLIC HEARING STATEMENT
CHARLESTON DISTRICT CORPS OF ENGINEERS
BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA

Presented by: NEVY D. HAY, PRESIDENT
SOUTH CAROLINA ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION, INC.

Subject: SUPPLEMENT TO E.I.S.

The supplement to the E.I.S. is based on an independent review of the ground
water. The South Carolina Water Resources Board reviewed the supplement and
found it to be consistent with the standards established by the Corps of Engineers.

The main focus of the supplement is on the potential impact of the project on the
local water supply. The review concluded that the project would not have a
significant impact on the groundwater levels, but it would affect surface water
flows temporarily during construction.

The supplement also includes a detailed analysis of the construction methods and
the steps taken to minimize environmental impacts. The project team has
implemented several measures to ensure minimal disruption to the natural
environment.

In conclusion, the supplement to the E.I.S. provides a comprehensive picture of
the potential environmental effects of the project and reassures the community
that the project is being managed in an environmentally responsible manner.
Colonel Barney Wilson, Jr.
Charleston C. H. W. E.
Charleston, S. C.

Dear Colonel Wilson:

SUBJECT: Supplement to Final Environmental Statement.
Application for the use of S.C. Water Company to construct pier in Colleton River

Failure to supplement to address ground water.

Paragraph 3.37: It is true, as the point of the Corps of Engineers to take portions of the water in the river for the benefit of the Army without writing that section have in the proper order to prevent the pollution facts. But to the other point that appears in the paragraph, it is not
well as it. The Corps of Engineers is charged with the duty of making
the staff of that effort in order to secure all that is necessary on the effects of the pollution or other ventures which may be brought to your attention. The Corps of Engineers is not charged with
the same. It should be noted that the Corps of Engineers is not charged
with the use of the water in the river for the benefit of the public.

Paragraph 3.38: This point is clearly indicated. It is the point that the
public is not to be allowed to use the Corps of Engineers water for
the benefit of the public. The Corps of Engineers is not charged
with the use of the water in the river for the benefit of the public.

Exhibit 39: Underwater Electric Reversal of the proposed use of
the Corps of Engineers water by the public. This point is clearly
indicated. It is the point that the Corps of Engineers is not charged
with the use of the water in the river for the benefit of the public.
We are incorporating by reference herein previous comments filed by the Association in connection to the draft environmental impact statement and the final environmental impact statement and we are also incorporating these comments which will be filed with respect to the revised environmental impact statement of the Association's co-counsel, Lunden, Brown, Weinberg & Palmer.

Very truly yours,

John C. Stout, Jr.
Attorney for the Colleton River
Area Landowners Association

Date: September 1975

cc: Mary O. Worrall, Chairman CRAL
    Margaret B. Lambeth, Chairman CRAL
    Frederick L. Mann, Jr., Counsel, Brown, Weinberg & Palmer

Dear Colonel Wilson Jr.

This is a request that you deny the permit for the Colleton River to undergo a construction plan in the Colleton River, for the following reasons:

1. The environmental impact study issued in the draft EIS is inadequate in that it contains a defect in its rating system, which was adopted by CBG, as outlined in the EIS, made by CBG, and it is both incomplete and inaccurate. In this regard, the draft EIS is incomplete and EIS is not presented.

2. CBG changed its original agreement to leave a large buffer zone. They now ask for another permit to sell a large portion of the buffer zone with no restrictions.

3. CBG have elected not to notify the Corps of engineers concerning the project. They have a right to do so but it is not within the scope of the Corps' jurisdiction.
or all of the metal plate products other than EIL containers referred to in the fourth paragraph of your letter of February 12, 1975.

If such were the case, the facility at Victoria Bluff would for the near future constitute a multi-wast project to help the unemployment situation in this area with, again, little promise in the foreseeable future of providing steady jobs, considering the near-term prospects of unusual activity in the nuclear reactor, coal gasification and offshore drilling fields.

This whole project has assumed such a speculative aspect, as far as actual needs and their fulfillment is concerned, EIL's application merits a very careful further appraisal by the Corps. It is obvious that the remarkable growth in most economic indicators for Beaufort County over the past several years is attributable to its attractiveness as a resort and recreation area. So, why should the old project of doubtful economic need but unwise cancellation of one of the most attractive natural spots left in the county, be given the benefit of any doubt the Corps might have in its hopefully objective and impartial analysis of the matter.

Sincerely,

W. R. Satterfield
ment fails to meet the requirements, the existing objection to the
permit by the Department of Interior and the Department of the Interior.

In sum, the proposed action is inadequate as the draft and final impact
statements prepared by the Charleston District Office. The Corps has yet
to prepare the truly independent, objective and comprehensive impact state-
ment required by NEPA. The Charleston District Office has made a mockery
of the impact statement process and of the public hearing process.

Under the circumstances, we are forced to conclude that participation
in this project would violate our basic environmental objec-
tions.

tonight, at the hearing tonight and the hearings to be held by all
others at the hearing tonight and our concern on the final impact state-
ments.

Colonel conducted the hearing tonight. How do you think our
questions tonight.

THE BATTLEFIELD;
P.O. Box 17
Charleston, S.C.

9/5/75

Charleston District
Corps of Engineers
Department of the Army
Charleston, S.C.

Res BN 7-86 (Revised)

Gentlemen:

As a concerned citizen of Summerville, I attended the public
hearing tonight on the proposed Federal action involving
their current BN 7-86 project at the Summerville public hearing.

Although the hearing was postponed for two weeks
either side of the Summerville public hearing, the
four public hearings held, the Summerville public hearing,
the appointment of the public hearing examiner, and the
next Charleston public hearing, the gentleman conducting
the hearing questions tonight, I have the opportunity to
the benefit of your questions:

1. The project will cause an upset on the existing nervous
and temperamental number of people in the Summerville area.

2. Details of the hearing examiner at the Summerville
Charleston hearing with the Summerville hearing.

3. The economic impact of the project, the potential impact,
market conditions, economic potential, and the economic
vessel building potential in the Summerville area.

As to the 3rd point, I would like to ask the gentleman
section of the project, which will affect the Summerville
by making the process. I have included the words
However, the gentleman conducting will be
the area.

The hearing.

The Hearing.
In view of the fact that we find it essential to attain the tax benefits expected in the AM & E investment we have no other but to proceed in the manner of the AM & E project. Under the provisions of the Water Utilities Act, Public Law 89-27, the state agency of water, the Water Authority of the Colleter River, shall provide for the AM & E plant and shall also provide for the treatment facilities for their effluent and at least a 90% reduction of the raw sewage effluent to the plant prior to wasting it in the Colleter River.

(3) No treatment has been proposed for their painting shop or paint room wastes.

(4) As this plant is to be a fabrication plant for metal plates, the "corrosion protection" of the plates must be done here or at some other site. If this item is to be done at this site, an approved laboratory degree of treatment must be provided prior to discharge of their effluent to the Colleter River.

(5) If such treatment is to be provided at another site for plates to be assembled here, we will not object thereto.

(6) Oil spills and sanitary wastes from visiting ships cannot be sanctioned and must be carefully inspected for their visits. Proper treatment of these wastes must be provided for by C. S. & I.

(7) Subject plant should not be permitted to obtain their water from the Colleter Bluestone Aquifer, because of the possibility of the lowering of the water pumping levels in our wells. There will also be danger of salt water intrusion into our water supply due to excessive draw-down of the Aquifer. Both these items would cause unnecessary expense to land owners.

(8) All of the above items should be seriously considered before granting a dredging permit to the C. S. & I.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Hilton Head Public Service Council
Post Office Box 5156
Hilton Head Island, South Carolina 29928

September 4, 1975

Statement made by Charles M. Ackley, Chairman, Public Service Council Hilton Head Island - (coordinating body representing Public Service Districts on Hilton Head Island).

Col. Wilson -

Ladies & Gentlemen -

The concern expressed by me this evening is on behalf of all of the Districts furnishing water for all purposes to most of the 6,000 residents on Hilton Head Island. This same concern must be taken very seriously by other communities such as Bluffton, Barrel Landing and the individual farms and plantations such as Pepper Hall, and Moss Creek Plantations and others.

Mr. Orton Hack in a letter to Col. Wilson dated 3 March 75 posed the questions of both dredging and pile driving hazards. We all awaited an answer with objective technical information, perhaps putting our fears to rest, in the supplement which we are discussing tonight.

Instead of answering these questions the author of the supplement blithely ignored the right of the people and of public bodies to have satisfactory answers to their questions.

The August supplement shows - a pier or marginal wharf located at the same point and at least 800 feet long. From this it can be assumed that the original plan of a 500 foot wharf is still planned. A line of piling or pilings has been laid, resting on or penetrating the cap rock, which would create a massive flow and/or crack in this rock, the length of 3 football fields. This cap rock is of hard dense cherry limestone which is some times porous. According to local knowledge and Professor Colquhoun of USC it is very erratic in occurrence. In the drilling on Spring Island across from Victoria Bluffs the cap rock is entirely absent. In the recent ladies island Bridge Pier Construction it was found to be only 12" thick.

The other overlaying in the Hawthorne formation, this contains secondary aquifers which could easily destroy any skin friction on pilings. The soft medium of sand and silt have little bearing. The line sand and clay are still due difficult to penetrate.

Again quoting Professor Colquhoun, the correlation of the various parts 75 the Hawthorne formation have proved impossible. At least by the sonic methods used to date.

We know that at Spring Island the acquirer is 80 feet below MSL at the Colleton Channel it is 60 feet below MSL. Does this slope continue to rise under Victoria Bluffs? We have no proof to the contrary.

CBI has made 20 drillings in the area and 15 bore holes were drilled in the Port Royal Sound Study. After the question was raised at the second meeting why weren't the logs included in the supplement or an appendix to it?

In the seminars we attended on Preparation of Environmental Impact Statements we were taught that they must be factual, objective and complete. That questions raised by the public were to be considered and answered.

This supplement and the document it is supposed to be complete, not objective and does not answer questions raised to date.

The Ocala aquifer or Sandier limestone is the only source of water for the area south of Broad River and Port Royal Sound. It is not a pile of sand as the media has quoted a CBI official.

The people of Beaufort and vicinity used to drink artesian well water from the acquirer, but due to dredging - over pumping - and other factors now drink Savannah River water.

Beaufort, Port Royal, Burton and the military stations near by are served by a canal bearing Savannah River water that contains one million dollars, a treatment plant that costs 1.5 million dollars and a total system which has cost from 6-9 million dollars, today twelve million would be cheaper.

The people south of the Broad River don't have any 2 million dollars to spare and there are no military stations present to induce the Federal government to help out with interest free loans.

The dredging has been listed at 27 feet. I can't conceive of an 850 foot wharf and a 27 foot channel in front of it.

However, the piling supporting the wharf whose 240 foot, live load surcharge is unknown and which are shown in drawings, in the final EIS at 18" - 16" reinforced concrete piles of unknown length - are one of the main threats to our sole water source - the acquirer.
boreholes transverse to the axis of flow of the Colleton River in the EIS or its supplement?

3. Sound foundation engineering practice demands not only test borings with undisturbed core samples but test piles driven to load capacities or refusal or both. If the engineers of C.B.I. specify an 18" x 18" reinforced concrete piling of unknown length in the E.I.S. they must have test pile data, or they don't care how much they will damage the aquifer. Why are not the results of test piles driven in the E.I.S. or its supplement?

4. If test pilings have not been driven and logs of the tests made how did C.B.I. elect to use 18" x 18" reinforced concrete piles?

5. During the hearing Col. Wilson stated that he knew the length of the proposed piles but not the number of them. Why can't the public know both the length and spacing of them?

6. The Savannah Newspaper carried the story of the halting of construction of the water front improvements by Charleston District C. of E. In the City of Beaufort on the Beaufort River because 70 foot pilings had been driven which were in excess of the 40 foot piles approved in the permit.

In the Island Packet of Thursday 18 September there was a story that a similar limitation would be placed by the Charleston District on pilings for the C.B.I. construction. Two questions arise from this statement.

a. Will the limitation be based on a profile of the substrata or just a blanket number of feet of piling?

b. Will the types of piling be limited to avoid creating point loading and a subsequent fault in the cap rock, or avoid the need to penetrate the aquifer?

End of Questions

I wish to complement you on your conduct of the Public Hearing on 20 Feb. and was happy to meet you on that occasion.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Charles M. Ackley, P.E.
Chairman - Hilton Head No. 1 Public Service District
Chairman - Hilton Head Public Service Council

In view of the fact that the Ocala Aquifer is the sole source of potable water on this island we must again request that until all engineering facts are known and presented with favorable results that permission to construct the wharf and dredge the channel be withheld.
researched all aspects of the project. The public has had ample
and sufficient time to express their opinion. The United States
Corps of Engineers is on firm ground and we submit and respectfully
request that this request for a permit for the Chicago Bridge & Iron
Company be granted as quickly and expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely,

Edward H. Loomis
Chairman

EMD, Inc.
The Institute requires that, before archeological clearance of the area can be given, an on-ground archeological survey of the project area be undertaken. This survey should be done at the earliest possible time in order that its time schedule will not interfere with proposed construction activities. If sites of importance are located, time must be allowed for mitigation of the adverse effects to them that the project might cause. This may require excavation of the sites or alteration of the project plans to avoid damage to the sites.

The South Carolina Department of Archives and History should be consulted as to the potential locations of historic buildings in the project area.

September 15, 1975

Col. Harry S. Wilson, Jr.
District Engineer
Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 912
Charleston, SC 29402

RE: 73/86 (Revised)

Dear Col. Wilson:

We appreciate the efforts of the Corps of Engineers in providing for the third public hearing for the subject permit request. We feel the Corps has done all possible to allow the public to express themselves on the questions and issues surrounding this project.

From personal observations at the meeting, it is crystal clear that no new evidence relevant to the permit request was presented.

The comments based on the possible damage to the aquifer by piling were entirely unfounded and not supported by any facts.

All references to dredging a channel to the sea were entirely out of order as this is not and has never been a part of the permit request. According to CAGS Chart 1240, the river bottom immediately in front of the area where the request for 27 feet is 31-37 feet deep. The dredging, as you know, is only to accommodate ships moored to the dock at dead low water.

The position of the United States Bureau of Wildlife and Fisheries is, in our opinion, ridiculous. There is no precedent and no valid reason for them to require all of CBIC's land to be restricted. This land is no different than the surrounding, adjoining property or the many thousands of acres in the same general vicinity.

Col. Wilson, we deeply regret and offer our sincere apologies that it is necessary for you as District Engineer for the Charleston District to be subjected to the abusive and arrogant remarks of some of those present at the hearing.

The application as submitted by the Chicago Bridge & Iron Company is according to the rules and regulations surrounding the use of water front property in the United States. The Environmental Impact Statement and Supplement there to was carefully, fully and expertly
a letter of intent from the State Ports Authority.

Question 6: Why this inconsistency, which very easily could be interpreted as deception or blundering by the Charleston District

In response to comment by Mr. Roberts Vaux, the Charleston District stated: "The secondary development impacts were discussed to the extent that present knowledge permits."

That can only be interpreted as an admission by the Charleston District that it has limited knowledge of the secondary impacts of the CBI project or of how to determine secondary impacts of a proposed project.

Question 7: What can be done to compel the Charleston District to
develop the expertise needed to determine secondary impacts, as required by NEDA, CEQ, and the Corps' own regulations?

In response to comment 65 by Mr. Vaux, the Charleston District stated: "The S.C. State Ports Authority has not yet formulated plans for the development of their site and will probably not do so until the CBI permit matter has been settled."

Question 8: What exactly has the Charleston District done to determine the State Ports Authority's plans for its site?

Question 9: May we please have copies of any correspondence between the Charleston District and the State Ports Authority on this point?

In response to comment 6 by the National Audubon Society, the Charleston District stated: "An effort was made during the testimony (February 1975) to answer all questions that could be answered at that time."

That is not true, Mr. Secretary. The transcript of the February 1975 public hearing will show that no such effort was made.

Question 10: Why this outrageous untruth and distortion?

In our comment 44 on the FEIS, we challenged this Corps statement -- "Further industrial development at Victoria Bluff is limited by state law designed to protect the natural values of the area." We asked that the law be identified.

In response, the Charleston District stated in the "Letters of Comment" document: "The law referred to in this comment is the act passed by the S.C. legislature providing for the transfer of State Ports Authority lands to the wildlife and marine resources department if a permit is granted to CBI."

Mr. Secretary, that in itself demonstrates that the earlier statement was just not accurate. The transfer law does not protect further industrial development at Victoria Bluff. That law clearly deals only with State Ports Authority land, not with privately-owned land. That law does not affect land the SCAF will retain after the transfer takes place, if ever.

Question 11: Why did the Charleston District distort the effect of the transfer law?

The "Letters of Comment on Final EIS" document prepared by the Charleston District contains other omissions and distortions that cannot hold up under public scrutiny and questioning. Perhaps the Charleston office made no attempt to inform the public of the existence of the document or to make it available to the public before the September 2 public hearing.

Question 12: Did CBI prepare any suggested responses to comments on the FEIS for the District office?

Question 13: If CBI did so, may we please have a copy of CBI's suggested responses?

Aside from the omissions and distortions, the document -- and the Charleston District's conduct throughout the CBI case -- raise some fundamental questions about Corps procedures and responsiveness to the public and to meeting the letter and spirit of CDA's requirements.

Whatever else comes out of the CBI case, I respectfully urge you and the Secretary of the Army to review the Charleston District's handling, or mishandling, of the CBI permit application. It is clear that the Corps's handling of this permit application has been neglected, if not ignored.

The Charleston District's refusal to commit itself on the existence of the "Letters of Comment on Final EIS" document, which purports to answer questions raised earlier.

I respectfully suggest that the Charleston District's handling of the entire CBI case thus far sets up a pattern for a public agency to deal with the public.

To conclude, I want to state once again for the record that we believe the draft and final impact statements, and the supplement to the SCAF, are greatly inadequate. They fail to meet the requirements set down by DEIS, the CDA guidelines, and Corps regulations. They have not built the complete record needed for a decision to issue the permit.

On the other hand, as I have stated before, we continue to believe that there is abundant evidence for denial of the permit for construction of a marine sanctuary in Port Royal Sound. And the record shows that CBI has acted to an already administratively-approved project.
October 9, 1975

Issuance of the permit based on the Corps' actions to date and the inadequate record established to date can only lead to further challenge and delay.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Enclosures:

[Name]
[Title]

[Name]
[Title]

Col. Harry S. Wilson, Jr.
District Engineer
Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 910
Charleston, SC 29402

Re: CBI - Victoria Bluff
Supplement to Final EIS

Dear Col. Wilson:

As many of us stated at the public hearing in Beaufort, South Carolina, 4 September, 1975, we remain amazed at the seeming and almost arrogant stance of the Charleston District Corps of Engineers in the CBI - Victoria Bluff matter. It strikes us that a few staff people, and not the entire environmental assessment process or the public, have a mockery of it -- if not actually scuttle it in this case.

We and others have raised so many important questions that have gone unanswered, that it is disheartening to try to work with the Corps. The Charleston office's attempt to limit comments to the slim three and one-half page supplement to the EIS prompts us to state that everything we have said heretofore about this project is to be considered an integral part of our comments on that short supplement.

To us, the recent change in plans produced in the entire project by those events touched on in the supplement are major in nature and their obvious consequences. Surely a broadened definition of the density to be manufactured and a deletion of 300 acres from the buffer area creates cause for restudy of the entire case. And it is clear that with the intention of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Victor V. Vesey, when he returned the case to the Charleston District Office.

Clearly, the haste and restrictive manner in which the Charleston office has attempted to handle this matter is deplorable.

The Coalition for Lower Beaufort County expresses a high percentage of the public's concern in the immediate impact area. Try as we have though, we have not yet answered or explanations from Charleston on these points, as the Corps rebuttal to issues raised by other offices' agencies: Commerce, Interior, and CEQ, for example.
Will the petition signed by more than 4,000 people seeking a Marine Sanctuary designation for this area be discussed in the final supplement? Will the public have opportunity to review and comment on the Corps' discussion? Are the Corps and a handful of politicians going to determine the destiny of this immediate area? How can we get the public's point of view recognized in the process?

Yours very truly,

Franklin O. House
Chairman
FOR:ps

cc: Dr. Elvis Stahr
    Hon. Nathaniel P. Reed
    Dr. Robert White
    Dr. Russell Peterson
    Mr. Fredric Miller, Jr.
    Mr. Carlyle Blakney
    Mr. John C. Stout, Jr.
    Mr. Orson Hack

COALITION FOR LOWER BEAUFORT COUNTY
One South Carolina Cir
Hilton Head Island, S.C. 29928
Phone 1803/671 2765

OPENING OF PUBLIC HEARING NOVEMBER 4, 1975

Colonel Wilson, my name is Franklin House. I speak here as Chairman of the Coalition for Lower Beaufort County.

The Coordinating Committee of the Coalition is composed of representatives from the respective boards of directors of nine major citizens organizations in the area. Their combined membership totals on the order of 5,000 property owners, including many with generations of continuous land ownership in the immediate and general area of Victoria Bluff. As additional evidence of the numerical strength of our Coalition, we have assembled more than 3,800 signatures of people petitioning for a Marine Sanctuary in the port Royal Sound area.

Recently, according to the press, one of your staff stated: "We don't want to hear about staff we already heard about for three months." Because a number of things said at earlier hearings have not been accurately and fully entered on the transcript—when submitted in writing—we ask your attention, sir, while I cite an example of a prior statement clearly mis-handled by your staff. We also ask what right does your staff have to edit the transcript of a public hearing?

The official "Transcript of Public Hearing Held on Permit Application of Chicago Bridge and Iron Company on 20 February 1975" states on page 11:

"(At the end of Dr. House's statement he had put on display two paintings depicting the artist's conception of what Oil would look like form the river.)" (emphasis added.)

That was correct for the smaller display but Exhibits 4 & 55, and pages 60, 62 and 70 of the transcript itself show that the larger representation was made from ground level at the north end of Hilton Head Island, several miles away from Victoria Bluff and the Ollerton River. The larger rendition was the subject of great concern and discussion at the hearing but in the transcript the subject, by omission, was obviously handled in a biased manner by the Corps of Engineers.

EXHIBIT 6
Hunt as letters in 100 Flowers Occlet No. 27138 clearly identify 0.04 0.05 0.11 A
a major oil to its property at Victoria Bluff and

otherwise clearly state that: "Fort Victoria is a deepwater site and

be a major A and B will become an active port." With such

evidence, we call upon the Corps of Engineers to discuss fully the

impact of a pier, a deepwater port, and in turn channelization of the

Columbus River. We further state that it will be recalled that CC had a plan for

the 'Scapu' project in 1973 and still requires the channel for the

proposed pier to which we mentioned in the revised application.

Further, in view of official findings contained in the South Carolina

"Fort Royal Sound Environmental Study" regarding the aquifer and fresh

water study in this area, we call on the Corps to make available to the

public its or future study of saltwater Intrusion at Victoria Bluff.

One of the views of the CC official who is reported as saying that

the nature of the aquifer here is not understood, we prefer to rely on the

"Fort Royal Sound Environmental Study" which states that the greatest

solute saltwater intrusion into the principal water-bearing zone

in found near Victoria Bluff where the few permeability cap is the thinnest.

In our view, this hazardous condition should not be treated lightly. Is

there not a conflict between the Corps' and the State's studies which should

be resolved for the benefit of the people?

Another question that has dropped from sight: What happened to the

Interior Department's call for a hydrologic study of the proposed pier and

docking channel stated in Assistant Secretary William A. Vogel's letter to

Colonel Robert A. Nelson dated February 24, 1974?

Daniel Wilson, a few minutes ago we heard Mr. William J. Stephenson

testify that the resolution of the CC Board of Directors contained authority

to purchase land but no authorization to build a plant. Under these

circumstances are not the Corps of Engineers, other Federal, State and Local

agencies or any combinations and individuals dealing with speculative

interests? Until the Company officially acts, how can the Corps be sure of

what is going to take place at Victoria Bluff? Until the Company knows what

its products will be how can it represent to the public the kind and number

of jobs it will have in its operations?

It troubles us that the Corps has seen fit to pick and choose from

among CC's statements in a manner to greatly favor the Company. For

example, CC said for many months that it should build LNG tanks but that

it would not otherwise industrialize the area. Why accept those statements

in the face of strong evidence to the contrary, for example: The CC

official's statement "The area as we see it in future years will be an

industrial area--and that's it." How industrialization of this type can

be considered compatible with existing business activities in the area is

beyond the comprehension of many knowledgeable people.

We urge the Corps of Engineers to recommend denial of this application

as not being in the best interest of the public.

Thank you.

9/4/75
September 3, 1975

District Engineer
Charleston District Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 919
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

RE: Final EIS, Chicago Bridge and Iron

Gentlemen:

1. Water runs off from the very large area of paved surface at the work site. Parking and should, if possible, be routed through a settling pond filter bed system prior to discharge into the Colleton River. This will prevent accidental discharge of surface pollutants such as oil and lubricant drips and normal fabrication litter from being washed directly into the river.

2. Although the A-scale sound response decibel level will be well within the OSHA guidelines, the writer is concerned with the possibility of sharp loud noises of short duration in the mid to higher pitch range for all associated with metal forming operations. These impact type noises do not show up on the A-scale sound response but could well be a severe nuisance factor to adjacent property owners as well as being extremely unsettling to wildlife. What will be the DNL levels at location of this type of instantaneous noise?

3. The writer would like a firm commitment from CBI to construct an osprey nesting platform approximately 60 - 70' in height.

4. The writer wishes to emphasize the position originally taken by Ogeechee Audubon with regard to future channel depth requirements between the facility and the river bluff and the open ocean. We are adamantly opposed to any new alterations at the Port Royal Sound estuary for navigation purposes. Any navigation 'improvements' between the old facility and the new would likely be detrimental to the environment. In order that CBI not be 'impractical' at some future date by very stringent opposition to any new channel depth improvements, we are clearly stating our opposition now.

5. At this time and for the future we would like an alternate site utilized for the new facility. Several areas downstream of the Colleton have been identified as a possible site location.

In closing, we would like to urge CBI, in the interest of being a good neighbor, to expand as much as possible the buffer zones between its manufacturing areas and adjacent property owners. The 60' buffer between CBI and the Camp property would be a much more effective barrier if it were increased to 100' or 110' in width.

Very truly yours,

J. L. Steyaert
Conservation Chairman
Ogeechee Audubon Society

JLS/js
Dear Colonel Walter:

I refer to your letter of Noble Telephone, 885 74 - 86 (Revised) August 30, 1975, and present the following report of the test well on the site of our proposed new office building in the Centerway Area. The following is a brief summary of the test results:

There was not been adequate testing of the Fresh Water aquifer for this region as described in your initial letter. In the test report of this project, the measured water flow from the test well gave a sufficient supply for the anticipated needs of the new building. Many things are lacking in this report. There is no mention of the water purity to the highly mineralized aquifer of this area (one readily finds the sutures). The velocity of water flow through the aquifer in extremely small. I have the water testing results must be well defined, giving the gradient in turn. The pressure gradient near the top of the aquifer to continuously provide fresh water. Without this data, there is no basis for important decisions. After the report of the water test well, I mentioned that the water is too elevated and artificial recharge is very substantially with natural means of winter and summer. Which would be necessary to maintain the water level of the water table with the water level of the surface water. Without this additional information, it is not possible to determine the water supply. The location of a new office building is necessary to the success of the enterprise. It is your responsibility to provide the necessary information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
May I suggest, Mr. Secretary, that we were impressed with the manner in which you handled this situation as reflected in your June 5, 1975 letter to Mr. Korda and your June 24, 1972 letter to Dr. Stahr. Your efforts, at least, were straightforward in letting the Congress, U.S., and the general public know under what circumstances you felt that you had the power to decide what course of action you would take. Nothing was hidden, no secret under lock and key.

Thank you for this opportunity to assist.

Sincerely,

Frederick E. Miller, Jr.

cc: Mr. Franklin House
Mr. Orion Bach
Mr. Marvin Gordon
Mr. Carlisle O. Blakeney, Jr.
Dr. Elvis Stein
Mr. Robert B. Smythe
Hon. Nathaniel F. Reed
Mr. Robert White
Col. Harry S. Wilson
My name is William J. Stellick and I am President of the Association of Sea Pine Plantation Owners, incorporated under the laws of the State of South Carolina. I am here to present the concerns of more than fifteen hundred individual property owners who are Association members. Our Board of Directors voted unanimously in support of this presentation.

FIRST — some general observations.

I have, in my business life, known United Bridge & Iron Company for more than thirty years. They are highly regarded by the construction industry as a great company. They are world-wide constructors and fabricators, incorporating in 185 years ago. In the United States they operate four fabricating plants and have a real estate operation. They have other plants throughout the world.

In their Annual Report issued on February 17, 1975, reference is made to their future plans for expansions at Covington, Alabama, Memphis, Tennessee, H&S in Waco, Killala in Ireland, Baton Island in Indonesia, Alberta in Canada and the pipeline project in Alaska.

I searched in vain, in this annual report, for any reference to plans concerning Victoria Bluff, South Carolina. I find it strange, if indeed there has been a positive decision to build a plant at Victoria Bluff, when and if a permit is issued, that there is no reference whatsoever of their intention to do so. In examination of three financial report reviews, made by three members of the New York Stock Exchange this year, I found there was no reference to Victoria Bluff. Normally, one would expect to find, in the Annual Report and financial reviews, some mention of the intention to build a new plant.

I also note that in the resolution of the Board of Directors of CBS, it is the authority to purchase land, but nothing to build a plant. Let's look at the record. There was a Public Hearing held here on July 26, 1973. At that time I testified that the latitude and longitude specified in the application located the site in the middle of the Chequamegon River, not in the Colleton River as claimed. In the December 1973 Draft Study, page 8, figure 5, it is noted that the derrick remains in the Chequamegon River. The Final Environmental Study, December 1974, page 7, figure 5, also places the derrick in the Chequamegon River. I was starting to believe that was where the derrick was going to be placed. I am glad to report the Notice of Public Hearing August 4, 1975 has the derrick in the Colleton River, except the claim is made that this is on the North Shore of the Colleton River, while it is actually on the South Shore.

The Final Environmental Study December 1974 and the Supplement of August 1975 merits attention. The latter states that the proposed facility will primarily manufacture L. N. G. aluminum containers with a proviso that, as business opportunities develop, other products may be. I repeat, may be fabricated.

At the Public Hearing on February 20, 1975, I testified there were 15 ocean-going tankers, for the transportation of L. N. G., under contract to the shippers. Two of the Gulf and East Coast, three at the Avondale Shipyards, New Orleans; seven with General Dynamics, Quincy, Mass.; three with Newport News Shipbuilding, Virginia and two at Sun Shipbuilding. All the L. N. G. tanks required for these ships have been provided for. No new tankers are cut for L. N. G. I suspect none of the fifteen tankers now under contract will be cancelled or delivery deferred until early 1975-76.

The entire issue for the demonstration of L. N. G. has run into deep trouble. The Federal Power Commission is currently reviewing all 15,000 shipbuilding contracts.
to import the gas, have been filed, the first one in February 1970. Five years have passed since the first one was filed and only one has won final, unconditional approval as reported by the Wall Street Journal. One has since been withdrawn. The original price of 63 cents, negotiated with the Indonesian Government in September 1972, has now been renegotiated to $1.25 per million B. T. U.'s. Algeria, the principal source of gas, has also decided to demand higher prices which are still to be renegotiated. They rescinded the original contract last year. The first of the French-built tankers was delivered to El Paso Gas last month. They have no immediate use for this tanker and the owners state it will be tied up in Norway for an indefinite period. Two more tankers will be delivered by the French next year to El Paso Gas and they also will be idle for some time to come.

Newport News have three tankers under contract with El Paso Gas, two to be delivered next year and one in 1977. Avondale Shipyards have three tankers for delivery to them through 1977. Delivery may have to be extended. Some of these new L. N. G. tankers, which cost $100 million, face an idle period of varying duration because technical problems have arisen in Algeria. The problem is to chill large volumes of the gas to minus 250 degrees Fahrenheit. There are also problems in the design of the receiving storage tanks in this country. An empty storage tank on Staten Island, N. Y., caught fire last year and killed 43 workers. The Federal Power Commission states the tanks "present many questions of public safety."

What does this all lead up to? The conclusion is clear. It will be many years before another keel is laid down in a United States shipyard for a tanker to transport L. N. G. It will be many years before a shipyard is awarded a new contract for an ocean-going tanker that will require the delivery of L. N. G. containers.

It is stated that containers for L. N. G. to be used in ocean-going vessels are kept at minus 250 degrees Fahrenheit. The

It is claimed on page 53 of the final E. I. S. that there will be a loss of capacity to import L. N. G., if the CBBI project does not get final approval. Nothing is further from the facts! The CBBI facility is not needed, and never has been needed, for the importation of L. N. G. To continue to claim justification for the Victoria Bluff facility, on the need for additional capacity to produce L. N. G. containers at this time, is to ignore the realities of today. I fail to understand why the supplement to the final E. I. S. overlooked this factor and allowed the record to stand with the statement that the facility is needed for the importation of L. N. G. and without it there would be a loss of capacity to import L. N. G.

Let the record show that the efforts and policy of the Congress and the Administration are directed to freeing our Country from dependence on imported energy. The progress of time has disclosed, that those who control the gas reserves abroad have taken a page from the O. P. E. C. countries, when it comes to setting the purchase price for their product.
It is to be noted, in accordance with the rules of Senate Procedure, that the
Committee now reports that the Corporation will continue to pay costs for
the completion of the project, subject to the approval of the project by the
Committee, but the Corporation will not be responsible for any costs in
the event that the project is not approved by the Committee.

Next, let us turn our attention to the public interest, in this instance, the
inference made by the Corporation that the plant will be built within 12 months
after the permit is issued, as shown on page 36 of the Final E.I.S., and that 400
to 700 persons will be on the job within six months thereafter. We now take
note that no time line is established in the absence of any timetable for the
building of the plant and that initially, only 20 to 25 employees will be hired
in the first month and that the 400 employee level will be reached in about
three to five years, or six months after the plant is built.

Is it in the Public Interest to approve the deletion of 30 acres from the
buffer zone? The future use of these 30 acres and the 30 acres of land
originally to remain in its natural state, is not controlled by any decree on
page 38 of the Final E.I.S. it is acknowledged that the effects of other
industry on the local environment are not revealed.

Is it in the Public Interest to invade the pristine conditions of the
Port Royal estuary and start a gymnasium at Victoria Bluff?

Is it in the Public Interest to issue the requested permit that will
forever compromise the future planning of this area and "sell a course for
heavy industrialization? The single purpose pursuit of a possible short-term
profit can be counter-productive and, as Senator Hollings has written, "in this
pursuit, the thoughtful protection of existing or potential benefits, such as
wildlife, fisheries and recreation, has too frequently been ignored."

Is it in the Public Interest to risk the condition of the potential
fresh water aquifer, a major source of water for this area? The plan to build
the dam and to support the 1000 new dollars required that 400 heavy

The proposed dam and the storage of the water in the dam are not
discussed in the plan, which is a major omission in the Final E.I.S. study. The
situation is such that it appears that the water will not be adequately
networked in the aquifer. Figure 25 on page 35 of the Final E.I.S. shows
that the confining beds are 380 feet below the water surface. The confining beds
are 30 feet thick in depth. On the bottom of the bed and in the upper area,
there is a protective crust. This Ocala aquifer is the principal source of water for
this area and damage to the protective crust would be catastrophic to water quality.
It is estimated that the 18 square concrete and steel pipes would be driven
through the confining beds, through the protective crust and deep into the
aquifer. It is noted in statement on page 35 of the Final E.I.S. that damage to
the water source has no effect on underlying aquifers and this may be so.
We notice there is no statement made that damage to the concrete and steel pipes
in the aquifer presents a potential risk to the aquifer. If our fresh water is
invaded by salt water, does C.B.I. Corps of Engineers or the public pay the
bill?

Is it in the Public Interest to continue to build on the potential trucks
for incoming raw materials and perhaps an outflow of finished product?
Reference is made to the greater auto traffic density on Highway 670 in
the periods of time when people are going to and from work. The large
potential truck traffic should have been taken into consideration in the evaluation of
the impact of this facility.

Is it in the Public Interest to set up a situation that will continue to
cast a shadow over this area. We first had BASF, then Brown & Root. During
these unsettled years great uncertainty as to the future use of the area prevailed.
If a permit, good for three years is issued, subject to renewal, the uncertainty
continues. The Final E.I.S. states that other options have been considered
for land-use at Victoria Bluff include an Institute of Higher Education, Con-
serve and Education Center, light industrial plants, or executive plant or a
In April of 1940, California officials met to discuss plans for the development of the state's mineral resources. At this time, the oil industry was facing a downturn due to the Great Depression, and there was a need to find new sources of energy. The state's natural gas reserves were considered to be a potential solution. However, the industry was concerned about the environmental impact of drilling for gas. As a result, a committee was formed to explore the options and make recommendations.

In April of 1940, the Secretary of the Army was appointed to the committee. This would be a "Team Against Nature" and against the interests of all the people in the state. The Secretary of the Army was to issue the orders requested by the legislature.

[Handwritten note:]

1. The Secretary of the Army was appointed to the committee. This would be a "Team Against Nature" and against the interests of all the people in the state. The Secretary of the Army was to issue the orders requested by the legislature.

2. [Additional handwritten notes and comments.]

3. [Further handwritten notes and comments.]

4. [Additional handwritten notes and comments.]
RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENT

Environmental Protection Agency

Discussion of the deletion of 308 acres from the permit request is expanded in Section 5 of this supplement.

U. S. Department of Interior

1. Discussion of the deletion of 308 acres from the permit request is expanded in Section 5 of this supplement.

2. Discussion of a possible railroad is expanded in Section 8.5 of this supplement.

3. When CB&I began in 1971 its search for a plant site, its representative contacted port authorities, chambers of commerce, development commissions, and realtors for assistance. Many sites were inspected and rejected for failure to meet one or more of the eight criteria considered essential by CB&I. The seven-line paragraph in Section 5.012 of the final EIS (Section 4 of this supplement) states in effect that CB&I could not find a site meeting its eight criteria for suitability in the vicinity of areas number 2, 6, 7, and 8. Failure of all sites considered in the vicinity of these four areas to meet one or more of eight essential criteria was ascertained without a detailed investigation. Once CB&I determined that a site was unsuitable, it discontinued any further consideration of that site.

An alternative site is considered to be a site which meets the operational requirements of the applicant. In this sense, areas 2, 6, 7, and 8 were not analyzed alternatives because CB&I has stated these four areas would not serve its needs. Therefore, the position of USDH that unsuitable sites be considered as alternative sites, i.e., suitable sites, appears inappropriate. There are in actuality no alternative sites in these four areas which could be discussed and compared with other alternative sites. See also response number 3 to letter of USDH on page B-75.

4. Discussion of a proposed marine sanctuary has been expanded and updated in Section 5 of this supplement.

5. The suggestion that the Corps contact the National Park Service about the national landmark designation was implemented and the information derived from this contact is reflected in the discussion of this issue in Section 6 of this supplement.

6. Discussion of a possible channel is expanded in Section 9 of this supplement.
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7. Discussion of the potential for secondary development of adjacent lands is expanded and updated in Section 8 of this supplement.

**S. C. Wildlife and Marine Resources**

No response is required.

**S. C. Department of Archives and History**

No response is required.

**S. C. State Archaeologist**

The responsibility for survey and salvage of archaeological and historical resources at permit areas was delegated to the Secretary of the Interior by Section 4 of the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, Public Law 93-291. The Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, National Park Service was given a copy of the letter from the State Archaeologist and asked to perform surveys and salvage of archaeological historical resources as may be warranted by the public interest.

**Beaufort County Development Commission**

No response is required.

**Hilton Head Public Service Council**

1. Drilling logs were not contained in the EIS because very few people would have been able to interpret them. Also as is discussed in Section 7 of this supplement, sufficient information was presented in the EIS to indicate that the proposed action would not affect ground water resources.

2. The Corps' concern with piles is only with the environmental impact of their use. As discussed in Section 7 of this supplement, there is no reason to anticipate any adverse environmental impact from the use of piles. Test pile data would be obtained for load bearing purposes and the need for test pile is at the discretion of the structural engineers. Contrary to the assertion in this comment, not all foundation work requires test pile.

3. The spacing of the pile is a design feature which has not yet been determined. CB&I has indicated that detailed plans and specifications will not be done until the permit is issued; nevertheless, as discussed in Section 7 of this supplement, there is no reason to believe piling would adversely affect the underlying aquifer.
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4. The District Engineer proposes to condition any permit issued to CB&I, to require the submission and approval of design and construction methods for piling.

5. The effects of dredging and piling on the freshwater aquifer are discussed in Section 7 of this supplement.

6. CB&I's requirement for fresh water is described in Section 1.11 of the final EIS and consists of domestic water for its work force and a one-time withdrawal of water for proof-testing LNG tanks. Ground water resources are discussed in Section 2.07 and the impact of CB&I's projected withdrawals on these resources is discussed in Section 3.11. The information contained in the cited sections of the EIS is sufficient to support a determination that ground water resources are adequate to meet area needs plus the needs of CB&I. The USGS is now studying the ground water resources of this area and the Corps has requested of the Service an evaluation based on their most recent data of the capacity of existing ground water resources to meet existing area demands plus the needs of CB&I. The following letter indicates that the withdrawals proposed by CB&I should not adversely affect ground water resources.
January 26, 1976

Harry S. Wilson, Jr.
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer, Charleston District
Post Office Box 919
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

Dear Colonel Wilson:

In reference to your letter of 23 December 1975, the following information is submitted. In the spring of 1970, Layne-Atlantic, Company, Inc. drilled one production well and four observation wells, specifically for the purpose of making a quantitative hydraulic appraisal of the primary artesian limestone aquifer (known locally as the Ocalia Limestone Formation) underlying Victoria Bluff, South Carolina.

Results of the aquifer test, obtained by Layne-Western, acting as consultant to Layne-Atlantic, indicate that reasonable values of transmissivity and storage are, respectively, 420,000 gpd/ft (gallons per day per foot width of aquifer) and .0002. Using these figures and a constant pumpage rate of 21 gpm (gallons per minute) or about 30,000 gpd (gallons per day), Exhibit 1 was constructed. As can be seen from Exhibit 1, the effects of the proposed pumpage of 12,000 to 30,000 gpd at Victoria Bluff would be negligible at Hilton Head Island. For example, after pumping at a rate of 30,000 gpd for 100,000 days, the drawdown at a distance of 20,000 feet generated by this pumpage would be only 0.07 foot.

Exhibit 1 is based on the unlikely assumption that there is no leakage of water through the confining bed to replace the water removed by pumpage, that no recharge or discharge barriers are encountered, that natural recharge and discharge are unchanged, and that the aquifer is isotropic and homogeneous. If there were leakage or a recharge barrier, the drawdown, as indicated in Exhibit 1, would be less and at some distance from the pumped well and at some point in time would be zero. As possible evidence for leakage it should be noted that although ground-water withdrawals have increased rapidly at Hilton Head Island during the past few years (estimated average daily withdrawal is 15-20 million gpd), the average yearly potentiometric surface
at the proposed CBI site, Victoria Bluff and at Palmetto Dunes, Hilton Head Island does not show any significant downward trend for the 1974 and 1975 water years (Exhibit 2). Also, numerous water level measurements made at different locations on Hilton Head Island indicate that the average potentiometric surface has not declined any significant amount in the past two years.

Sincerely yours,

Larry R. Hayes
Hydrologist

LRH:aj
Enclosures
Exhibit 1 - Drawdown generated in potentiometric surface of the Ocala aquifer by a constant withdrawal of 30,000 gpd at Victoria Bluff, South Carolina.
Exhibit 2 - Monthly mean water levels in feet below measuring point, October 1973 to September 1975
1. Liquid waste treatment is discussed in Section 5.3.4 of this supplement and Section 1.1.2 of the final EIS. There will be no effluent into any waterway.

2. CB&I does not have any definite prospects for fabricating products other than LNG tanks. Some other products may require painting, which would be done inside under OSHA standards. If painting is required, any excess paint and cleaning fluids would be disposed of in compliance with applicable Federal and State standards.

3. Any ships moored at the CB&I wharf would be connected to on-shore sanitary facilities. Laws and regulations pertaining to oil spills are administered by the U. S. Coast Guard. At peak production CB&I would produce LNG tanks for two ships per year.

4. A similar comment is discussed in response 6 to a letter of the Hilton Head Public Service Council in Appendix A of this supplement.

Hugh H. Gordon

Discussion of a possible channel is expanded in Section 9 of this supplement.

National Audubon Society

1. The letters of comment on the final EIS and responses thereto are contained in Appendix B of this supplement.

2. Discussion of other products is expanded in Section 2 of this supplement.

3. Discussion of a possible channel is expanded in Section 9 of this supplement.

4. CB&I cannot enter into a contract until a plant site has been definitely selected.

5. Discussion of land deleted from the permit request is expanded in Section 5 of this supplement.

6. This supplement contains a detailed discussion of the controversial aspects of CB&I's permit application.

7. Discussion of the marine sanctuary proposal is expanded and updated in Section 5 of this supplement. Responses to comments of USDI and USDC are contained in Appendix B.
W. R. Satterfield

1. The effects of piling on the freshwater aquifer is discussed in Section 7 of this supplement.

2. Discussion of a possible channel is expanded in Section 9 of this supplement.

3. A similar comment is discussed in responses 1 and 2 to the Statement of Coalition for Lower Beaufort County on page B-93 of this supplement.

John C. Stout (Colleton River Area Landowners Association)

1. Discussion of secondary effects is expanded in Section 3 and 8 of this supplement.

2. Discussion of the marine sanctuary proposal is expanded and updated in Section 5 of this supplement.

3. Comments on the draft EIS were addressed in the final EIS. Comments on the final EIS and the responses thereto are attached as Appendix B to this supplement.

Robert H. Stafford

1. The Army Corps of Engineers held several meetings with CB&I to explain Corps requirements for input to an EIS and to apprise the applicant of available sources of environmental information. The environmental report submitted by CB&I was thoroughly evaluated and revised as deemed appropriate by this office in accordance with CEQ guidelines. All appropriate NEPA requirements as set forth by CEQ guidelines have been met. The charge of plagiarism is unfounded since CB&I prepared its report for Corps use as a source document for the EIS.

2. Discussion of the deletion of 308 acres from the permit request is expanded in Section 3 of this supplement.

3. Discussion of the provision for the fabrication of other products is expanded in Section 2 of this supplement.

4. The impact of piling on the freshwater aquifer is discussed in Section 7 of this supplement.

5. CB&I has indicated that fabrication of LNG tanks or related metal products will necessitate the employment of around 600 people. To the maximum extent possible CB&I will hire locally. As long as there is no violation of applicable Federal or State
employment base, the Corps of Engineers cannot dictate CBM employ-
ment practices and must rely on its assertions that it will
hire locally.

3. a. Environmental Action, Inc.

1. A similar comment is discussed in response 6 to letter of the
Hilton Head Public Service Council in Appendix A of this supple-
ment.

2. The impact of piling on the freshwater aquifer is discussed
in Section 7 of this supplement. See also in Appendix A of this
supplement the responses to letter from Hilton Head Public Ser-
vice Council.

National Audubon Society

1. This interim final supplement contains an expanded discussion
of the changes in the original permit request and also summarizes
and clarifies the discussion found in the final EIS of the more
controversial aspects of the permit application.

2. The comments on the final EIS and draft supplement to the final
EIS and responses thereto are attached as appendices to this supple-
ment.

3. Discussion of the proposed marine sanctuary has been expanded
and updated in Section 5 of this supplement.

4. The impact of piling on the freshwater aquifer is discussed in
Section 7 of this supplement. See also in Appendix A the responses
to the letter from the Hilton Head Public Service Council.

5. The comments received on the final EIS and the responses pre-
pared thereto were not distributed to the public unless requested.
Neither the Corps nor other federal agencies routinely distribute
comments and responses on final EIS's.

The Corps did not change its mind, but simply revised a statement to
more accurately reflect an evaluation, which is further substantiated
in Section 5 of this supplement.

7. The reconnaissance study on a navigation feasibility study of
a proposed navigation channel in the Colleton and Chechessee Rivers
was commenced by the District at the request of the SCPSA. This
reconnaissance study was essentially completed by the District Office,
but was terminated at the request of the SCPSA prior to its submission.
The review and approval to the South Atlantic Division Office of the Corps of Engineers in Atlanta, Georgia.

9. Additional discussion on possible future events related to the proposed development has been added to this supplement.

9. The Corps acquired its information on the plans of the State Port Authority by reviewing the deposition given by Mr. Welch, which is discussed in Section 8 of this supplement, and by asking representatives of the SPA what their plans might be.

10. The Corps did not say that the referenced law would "prevent" further industrial development as implied by National Audubon, but only said it would "limit" further industrial development.

The statement is true, since most of the SPA property which comprises a major part of Victoria Bluff would be transferred to the S.C. Wildlife and Marine Resources Department, an agency having no function in industrial development.

11. The State did not prepare any responses to the final EIS.

Coalition for Lower Beaufort County

1. This interim final supplement contains an expanded discussion of the changes in the original permit request and also summarizes and clarifies the discussion found in the final EIS of the more controversial aspects of the permit request.

2. Discussion of the proposed marine sanctuary has been expanded and updated in Section 5 of this supplement.

3. The transcript of the public hearing contains everything spoken into either of the microphones. Because of the large size of the auditorium, statements made away from the microphone may have been missed.

4. Discussion of the possible railroad has been expanded in Section 6 of this supplement.

5. The impact of piling on the freshwater aquifer is discussed in Section 7 of this supplement. See also in Appendix A the response to the letter from the Hilton Head Public Service Council.

6. The question raised by the Department of Interior was addressed in the EIS. No further comments on this question have been made by the Department of Interior.

7. Discussion of the possible fabrication of other products has been expanded in Section 2 of this supplement.
8. Discussion of further industrialization has been expanded in Sections 3 and 8 of this supplement.

Ogeechee Audubon Society

1. Discussion of the impact of surface runoff on water quality is expanded in Section 5.3.2 of this supplement.

2. Much of the loud noise commonly associated with metal fabrication is due to riveting which is being replaced by other techniques. There would be no riveting involved in the fabrication of any of the potential products of the proposed facility nor would there be other operations which would generate sharp, loud noises in the mid to higher octave range. Metal forming in a press emits a low frequency sound and would be performed inside a building which would reduce its noise level.

3. As is discussed in Section 3.06 of the final EIS, a nesting platform is not considered necessary. However, if the Society wishes a commitment, it is suggested that the Society contact CB&I.

4. The opposition of the Society to a new channel is noted. As stated in the expanded discussion of channel requirements in Section 9 of this supplement, any future proposal for a channel would be submitted to the public review process.

5. Attention is directed to the discussion of alternatives in Section 4 of this supplement.

R. L. Chaplin, Ph. D.

1. A similar comment is discussed in response 4 to letter of F. J. Rawstrom in Appendix A of this supplement. Additional information is also contained in Section 7 of this supplement. Contrary to the assertion in this comment, the effect of the test well on the water table was noted in Section 2.07 of the final EIS.

2. CB&I has indicated that the majority of its work force will be local residents. Therefore, there will be no significant increase in pollution caused by the small number of new residents brought into the area by CB&I.

Law Offices, Duncan, Brown, Weinberg & Palmer

No response is required.
Mr. Stephens provides information on shipyards and their contracts for LNG tanks showing that the need for LNG tanks has already been met. On the other hand, CB&I, by virtue of its permit request, considers that a potential market for LNG tanks exists. Realizing the effects of a variable market, CB&I made clear its intention to manufacture related metal products in its recently revised permit application which is the subject of this supplement. Therefore, based on the information at hand, a detailed analysis of market demand for LNG tanks is not warranted. In any event, CB&I does not have any definite commitments and has informed the Corps that it cannot enter into any contracts until it has a definite decision on the application.

2. The EIS indicated that construction of the proposed facility would take "about 12 months", but did not say the facility would be built 12 months after the permit is issued. The EIS also clearly stated that contracts would determine the production rate which in turn would determine the number of employees and hours worked. Notice of Public Hearing dated 4 August 1975 addresses the build up of the work force.

3. Discussion of the deletion of 308 acres from the permit request is expanded in Section 5 of this supplement.

5. The Corps has not yet decided whether or not it is in the public interest to issue the requested permit.

6. The effects of piling on the freshwater aquifer is discussed in Section 7 of this supplement.

7. CB&I has indicated that estimated needs for raw materials would require about two trucks per day. All of its products would be shipped by water because of size or weight.

8. See response 5 above. Alternative uses of the area are discussed in Section 4 and 5 of this supplement.